

# **EXHIBIT 3**



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

RAVGEN, INC.,	)	AU:20-CV-00692-LY
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	AUSTIN, TEXAS
	)	
NATERA, INC., NSTX, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	FEBRUARY 28, 2023

\*\*\*\*\*  
TRANSCRIPT OF SCHEDULING CONFERENCE  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEE YEAKEL  
\*\*\*\*\*

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:     DERON R. DACUS  
                              THE DACUS FIRM, P.C.  
                              821 EAST SOUTHEAST LOOP 323, SUITE 430  
                              TYLER, TEXAS 75701

KERRI-ANN LIMBEEK  
DESMARAIS LLP  
230 PARK AVENUE, 26TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10169

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:   STEPHEN M. HASH, ALEXANDER T. PIALA  
                              MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
                              303 COLORADO STREET, SUITE 2200  
                              AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

MICHAEL J. SUMMERSGILL  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109

AMANDA L. MAJOR  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

COURT REPORTER:     ARLINDA RODRIGUEZ, CSR  
                              501 WEST 5TH STREET, SUITE 4152  
                              AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography, transcript  
produced by computer.



14:01:23 1 (Open court)

14:01:23 2 THE COURT: We're here today for a scheduling  
14:01:25 3 conference, or conference of some kind, in Cause Number  
14:01:26 4 20-CV-692, *Ravgen, Incorporated v. Natera, Incorporated* and  
14:01:32 5 others.

14:01:32 6 Let me start with the plaintiff, and tell me who is  
14:01:35 7 here, please.

14:01:36 8 MR. DACUS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Deron Dacus  
14:01:39 9 on behalf of the plaintiff, Ravgen. And here with me is  
14:01:43 10 Kerri-Ann Limbeek with the Desmarais law firm, and we're ready  
14:01:47 11 to proceed, Your Honor.

14:01:47 12 THE COURT: All right. Give my just a minute.  
14:01:54 13 There's so many people listed in the caption, I need to find  
14:01:57 14 you-all.

14:02:00 15 And for the defendants?

14:02:01 16 MR. HASH: Your Honor, Stephen Hash from McDermott  
14:02:04 17 Will & Emery, with Alex Piala, on behalf of Natera. We also  
14:02:09 18 have cocounsel Michael Summersgill and Amanda Major from Wilmer  
14:02:14 19 Hale. And we're ready to proceed.

14:02:18 20 THE COURT: All right. Give me those names again.  
14:02:22 21 You're Mr. Hash, and I got Ms. Major. Who else is here?

14:02:24 22 MR. HASH: Piala, P-i-a-l-a, from McDermott.

14:02:27 23 THE COURT: All right.

14:02:27 24 MR. HASH: And Summersgill, Michael Summersgill.

14:02:28 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. I've



14:15:02 1 defense in its contentions. It did not raise that defense  
14:15:05 2 during its interrogatory responses. And this is the first  
14:15:09 3 we're hearing of it from Natera based on a vacated order.

14:15:12 4 And so I don't think that Natera should be allowed to  
14:15:17 5 reopen discovery and motion practice on issues where Natera had  
14:15:22 6 the document in front of it and chose different defenses than  
14:15:26 7 the other defendants in different cases.

14:15:29 8 So we don't want to get into a situation where we're  
14:15:32 9 relitigating things that have already -- that -- you know, the  
14:15:37 10 parties have gone through this case and they've narrowed the  
14:15:40 11 asserted claims and they've narrowed the defenses and they've  
14:15:43 12 narrowed the prior art in preparation for trial. To now allow  
14:15:48 13 Natera to reopen discovery to argue different defenses, when  
14:15:53 14 nothing has changed on the facts and they had the license and  
14:15:56 15 they had all of the documents during discovery, I think would  
14:15:59 16 be very prejudicial and inefficient.

14:16:04 17 And so that -- in addition, after that order  
14:16:08 18 vacating -- after that order was vacated, there's been an  
14:16:13 19 amendment to the license indicating the parties' intent not --  
14:16:16 20 for that license not to apply to the defendants in this case  
14:16:21 21 and others. That makes -- you know, any motion on that is  
14:16:26 22 going to -- or any amendment to the answer to add that defense  
14:16:30 23 is going to be futile anyway.

14:16:33 24 THE COURT: Well, let me just say, if I were to  
14:16:35 25 reopen discovery, that does not mean it reopens discovery and



14:16:40 1 the defendants get to allege different things. Discovery is  
14:16:45 2 separate from pleadings. That does not mean I've reopened  
14:16:49 3 pleadings or allowed an amended pleading just if I reopen  
14:16:54 4 discovery. So just know that these things are maybe all  
14:16:58 5 connected like the boxcars on a railroad train, but it doesn't  
14:17:02 6 mean they all arrive at the station at the same time.

14:17:05 7 MS. LIMBEEK: Right. Thank you, Your Honor. I think  
14:17:07 8 that's our position, too. Is that while we may need to reopen  
14:17:10 9 discovery for a few very narrow categories of documents that  
14:17:14 10 were not available in this case before discovery closed and the  
14:17:18 11 case was stayed, we shouldn't be reopening discovery on  
14:17:23 12 anything that was available before discovery closed and  
14:17:27 13 dispositive motions happened in this case.

14:17:34 14 THE COURT: Go there first. Then you get a chance.

14:17:36 15 MR. SUMMERSGILL: Yes, sir. Thank you, Your Honor.

14:17:37 16 Just to respond to that, two things. To address the  
14:17:42 17 broader issue, the plaintiffs -- Ravgen are the ones who  
14:17:47 18 approached us that said discovery needed to be reopened,  
14:17:51 19 reopening both fact and expert discovery. Now, they've  
14:17:55 20 characterized it as, you know, very narrow discovery. But  
14:17:58 21 really what it is, is in the IPRs they made an argument that  
14:18:04 22 the claims require a specific type of agent that actually  
14:18:08 23 inhibits lysis.

14:18:09 24 In this case they don't have hard evidence right now  
14:18:17 25 that what is in the blood collection tubes that Natera uses



14:34:58 1 100 percent confident we can cut down the motions under the  
14:35:01 2 Court's direction, and -- and this case will be ready for trial  
14:35:05 3 whenever the Court says it can try us.

14:35:07 4 So if there -- if I have failed to answer anything,  
14:35:11 5 it wasn't by design. I'm happy to do it.

14:35:13 6 THE COURT: You've answered.

14:35:15 7 Let me hear from the defendant.

14:35:17 8 MR. SUMMERGILL: Thank you, Your Honor.

14:35:18 9 First piece is we think the case ought to remain  
14:35:22 10 stayed because there are IPRs pending where decisions will come  
14:35:26 11 out.

14:35:26 12 THE COURT: Well, no. Let me just stop there. If  
14:35:30 13 I'm going to open it up for some discovery and move along, that  
14:35:36 14 doesn't mean I'm going to open it up for everything for you to  
14:35:39 15 re-plead anything.

14:35:41 16 I can see merit in lifting the stay for you-all to do  
14:35:45 17 what you need to do to resolve some of those motions and get  
14:35:52 18 things moved around, where we can at least look at a trial  
14:35:58 19 setting instead of waiting until we see what this last result  
14:36:02 20 is going to be. And, you know, I would lift the stay, but  
14:36:09 21 then -- if I like what you're going to tell me about what you  
14:36:13 22 would do in the interim, but then tell you all you can do in  
14:36:18 23 the interim is A, B, C, and D until we get there.

14:36:21 24 One of my frustrations with what goes on at the --  
14:36:28 25 you know, the PTO and its various component parts is sometimes